

-5-

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11-13, 16, 17, 21-28 and 30-32 were rejected in an Office Action dated May 26, 2005. Further, claims 4-5, 8-10, 14-15, 18-20, and 29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1, 11, 21, 30, 33 and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein, and claims 2-9, 12-19, 22-29 and 31-32 have been amended in response to the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

I. Restriction Requirement

Applicants hereby affirm their election to prosecute the claims of Group 1 (claims 1-32) in response to the telephonic restriction requirement. Accordingly, claims 33 and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japan/EPO abstract '122 or patent ("Japan").

Solely to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have cancelled claims 1, 3, 11 and 13 without prejudice or disclaimer to the claimed subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these cancelled claims in a continuation application in the future.

III. The Objections to the Claims

Claims 4-5, 8-10, 14-15, 18-20 and 29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants submit that claims 4-5, 8-10, 14-15, 18-20 and 29 have been amended to meet the requirements set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, applicants submit that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

-6-

IV. The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claims 2, 6-7, 12, 16, 17, 21-28, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2, 6-7, 12, 16, 17, 21-28 and 30-32 have been amended to depend from claims which applicants believe are in condition for allowance based on the position set forth in Paragraph III, above. Support for these amendments is contained in the Detailed Description of the Invention. Accordingly, applicants submit that these dependent claims include further limitations to the allowable claims, and accordingly, are also now in condition for allowance.

V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present invention as defined by claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-29 and 31-32 is now in form for allowance. If further questions remain, applicants request that the Examiner telephone applicants' undersigned representative before issuing a further Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Lewis White

Carol A. Lewis White, 33,306
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: November 23, 2005